REMARKS

These remarks and the accompanying amendments are responsive to the Office Action dated June 16, 2006(hereinafter referred to as the "Office Action"). At the time of the last examination, Claims 32-49 and 60 were pending. of which, Claims 32, 41 and 60 are independent. The Office Action rejected all of the Claims 32-40 and 60 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over United States patent number 6,654,786 issued to Fox et al. (the patent hereinafter referred to as "Fox") in view of United States patent number 6,618,763 issued to Steinberg (the patent hereinafter referred to as "Steinberg"). The applicants respectfully traverse and request reconsideration in light of the following remarks. Upon studying Fox and Steinberg, the applicants find that all the claims of the present application are novel over and not unpatentable over Fox and Steinberg, either singly or in combination.

As the Office Action correctly states, Fox does not explicitly disclose: "means for displaying the received summary content according to data about said wireless terminal that is not transmitted to said push delivery control unit, the data differing from the data about said wireless terminal which is transmitted to said push delivery control unit". However, the applicants content that Steinberg also does not explicitly disclose "means for displaying the received summary content according to data about said wireless terminal that is not transmitted to said push delivery control unit, the data differing from the data about said wireless terminal which is transmitted to said push delivery control unit. Additionally, "means for displaying the received summary content according to data about said wireless terminal that is not transmitted to said push delivery control unit, the data differing from the data about said wireless terminal which is transmitted to said push delivery control unit" is not inherent in Fox and Steinberg.

Anyone (or any combination) of elements in "a virtual private wireless network implementing message delivery preferences of the user" by Steinberg does not comprise "means for displaying the received summary content according to data about said wireless terminal that is not transmitted to said push delivery control unit, the data differing from the data about said wireless terminal which is transmitted to said push delivery control unit". Specifically, a wireless device in Steinberg merely display content in a device neutral format which may be viewed using a browser or the like provided on the wireless device or content which is translated into a format compatible with the wireless device (col.5, lines 5-19). That is, the wireless device in Steinberg as well as Fox never displays the received summary content according to data about said wireless terminal that is not transmitted to said push delivery control unit, the data differing from the data about said wireless terminal which is transmitted to said push delivery control unit.

In contrast, the wireless terminal as recited in each of the independent claims recites "means for displaying" (as in independent Claim 32) or "displaying" as in independent Claims 41 and 60) "the received summary content according to data about said wireless terminal that is not transmitted to said push delivery control unit, the data differing from the data about said wireless terminal which is transmitted to said push delivery control unit". For instance, data associated with a wireless terminal is divided into data associated with a terminal to be transmitted to the push delivery control unit (that is, information which can be outputted outside of the terminal), and data associated with a wireless terminal not to be transmitted to the push deli very control unit (that is, information which must be concealed). The wireless terminal of the present invention can display the summary content previously delivered in accordance with the decision made by the push delivery control unit based upon the data associated with a wireless terminal not to be transmitted to the push delivery control unit. More specifically, the

received information may be reprocessed by the wireless terminal side based upon the data (private information) associated with a wireless terminal not to be transmitted to the push delivery control unit. With such feature, the wireless terminal of the present invention can further provide information according to user preference without placing a burden on the user and the delivery side, and can utilize network resources efficiently. Further, data associated with a terminal not to be transmitted to the push delivery control unit (that is, data which must be concealed) is not outputted outside, so that the user has a feeling of security because observance of privacy is ensured.

An object of Fox and Steinberg is different from that of the present invention. In addition, the structure object of the present invention producing the above advantageous results is neither disclosed nor inherent in Fox and Steinberg.

As will be appreciated from the foregoing, the new and unexpected result is produced in accordance with the present invention. Fox and Steinberg never provide the motivation and suggestion for one of ordinary skill in the, art to achieve the present invention. Thus, the present invention is clearly unobvious over the references, and the 35 U.S.C. 103(a) rejection should be withdrawn.

In the event that the Examiner finds remaining impediment to a prompt allowance of this application that may be clarified through a telephone interview, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned attorney.

Dated this 8th day of September, 2006.

Respectfully submitted,

/ADRIAN J. LEE/

Adrian J. Lee
Registration No. 42,785
Attorney for Applicants
Customer No. 022913

AJL:ds
AJL0000001134V001